TO BE, OR NOT TO BE;

A

NATION:

That is the Queſtion?

Hear Me, O Ye Great Men of the People; and Hearken with your Ears, Ye Rulers of the Congregation!

Give not thy Son, and Wife, thy Brother, and Friend, Power over Thee, while Thou liveſt: and Give not thy Goods to Another; leſt it Repent *Thee, and Thou* Intreat *for the ſame again!*

As long as Thou liveſt, and haſt Breath in Thee, Give not Thyſelf over to Any!

Eccleſiaſticus, Cap. 33.

Dublin:

PRINTED BY JOSEPH MEHAIN, 22, CASTLE-STREET.

1799.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO BE, OR NOT TO BE, &c.

WHEN the Queſtion of an Union has become ſo much the reigning Topic of the Day, it may not be conſidered altogether impertinent, or unintereſting to my Countrymen, to offer a few Remarks on the Subject.

I have read the production of the Gentleman Uſher of this Subject, thrown among Us, AT THIS CRISIS, as an Apple of Diſcord, with the Inſcription of "Arguments FOR and AGAINST an Union between Great Britain and Ireland conſidered." He ſets out on the firſt page, with ſaying, "The only fear is that it will not be properly debated."

It is ſtrange that he ſhould happen to ſplit upon the very rock, on which his fear ſeems to have erected a Beacon, for the direction of others. It muſt be confeſſed that he has not agitated the queſtion, "by paſſion or by force:" but, certain it is, that he has endeavoured to inſinuate his Opinion, by Arguments the moſt plauſible, fallacious, and inapplicable, that could well have been conceived.

Says he, "Two independent States, finding their ſeparate exiſtence mutually inconvenient, propoſe to form themſelves into one ſtate for their mutual benefit." (They find a ſtate of Celibacy mutually inconvenient; they, therefore, reſolve to take the advice of their Friends, and to propoſe a Treaty of Marriage, or, in other Words, an Union.—God grant they may turn out a happy Couple, and that the ſaid Union may not terminate in a Divorce!) This is the firſt and fundamental ground of his opinion; the premiſes from which he argues: but, if it ſhall

appear

appear that the premiſes are falſe, he muſt admit that the concluſion cannot be true.

Put it thus:

Two independent ſtates, finding their ſeparate exiſtence mutually inconvenient, propoſe to form themſelves into one State, for their mutual Benefit:

Great Britain and Ireland are two independent States, finding their ſeparate exiſtence mutually inconvenient;

Therefore, Great Britain and Ireland propoſe to form themſelves into one ſtate, for their mutual benefit.

This muſt be the form of proof: and, whenever this PRO and CON Advocate ſhall be able to eſtabliſh the Truth of the minor propoſition, then, and not before, can we aſſent to the Concluſion. The burthen of proof lies upon him; and, therefore, it is unneceſſary to add more upon this point; except that it

is

is equally incumbent on him, in this caſe, to prove that Ireland makes the Propoſal ſuggeſted in the Concluſion.

"When the SABINES found they could "not maintain themſelves any longer againſt "the ROMANS, and ſaw that by uniting "with them they had an opportunity of in- "creaſing their liberty, their happineſs, and "their power, they acted according to the "principles of reaſon and right in relin- "quiſhing their ſeparate independency as a "ſtate; and, by their union, laid the foun- "dation of ROMAN Greatneſs."

That is to ſay, (as ſome Hiſtorian, or Advocate for Union, in future Ages, may write) "When the IRISH found they could not maintain themſelves any longer againſt the BRITONS, and ſaw that by uniting with them they had an opportunity of increaſing their liberty, their happineſs, and their power, they acted according to the principles of reaſon and right, in relinquiſhing their ſeparate Independency as a ſtate; and by their

Union,

Union, laid the foundation of BRITISH Greatneſs."

And this is the reaſoning, and this one of the inſtances, which, as this excellent conſiderer of Arguments ſays, forms a complete Anſwer to all Declamation upon the common topics of national dignity and national pride.

Have we been ſtriving to maintain ourſelves againſt the Britons, as, he ſays, the Sabines were againſt the Romans? Are we at War with Great Britain, or negociating with her Ambaſſador for Terms of Peace? Have the Yeomen, or, in other words, the People, of Ireland, hazarded their Health, their Lives, and their Properties, in maintaining themſelves WITH the Britiſh againſt Invaders and Rebels? Does not every voice utter "The Yeomen are the Saviours "of Ireland?" They have worked out that Salvation, but as YESTERDAY; and yet, TO-DAY, their proud and immortalized Services are to be buried in the duſt, and they are

to

to be likened unto the Sabines who found they could not maintain themſelves any longer againſt the Romans; and thence it is inferred they would act according to the principles of reaſon and right in relinquiſhing now their ſeparate Independency as a ſtate; and, by their Union, laying the foundation of Britiſh Greatneſs.

It reminds Us of the Fable:

"An honeſt countryman obſerved a Snake, lying under a hedge, almoſt frozen to death. He was moved with compaſſion, and bringing it home, he laid it near the fire, and gave it ſome new milk. Thus fed and cheriſhed, the creature preſently began ro revive; but, no ſooner had he recovered ſtrength enough to do miſchief, than he ſprung upon the Countryman's Wife, bit one of his children; and, in ſhort, threw the whole family into confuſion and terror. Ungrateful Wretch! ſaid the man, thou haſt ſufficiently taught me how ill judged it is to confer benefits on the worthleſs and undeſerving."

Again;

Again: "England was formerly divided "into ſeven kingdoms, which were continu- "ally engaged in predatory Wars with each "other."

That is to ſay (as the Hiſtorian, or Advocate, may alſo write) "Great Britain was formerly divided into two Kingdoms, called England and Ireland, which were continually engaged in predatory Wars with each other."

In the name of common ſenſe, were thoſe arguments conceived and brought forth in a Dream; or how do they apply to the caſe before us? Are we engaged in predatory Wars with England? If a ſtranger was to hear ſuch arguments, he muſt inſtantly conclude that they treated of two Countries at open War, and who were in the act of conſidering the beſt means of effecting Peace. Suppoſe that the Engliſh found they could not maintain the preſent War any longer againſt the French; (which God Forbid!) would the former act, according to the principles of reaſon and right, in relinquiſhing their ſepa-

rate

rate independency as a ſtate; and by their Union, laying the foundation of French Greatneſs? Every Engliſhman muſt ſpurn at the Thought.

This Arguer has really employed his pen, in pointing out and proclaiming the comparative Inferiority of Ireland, and the WANT of advantages, which, he ſays, are to be attained by an Union.

In comparing the ſituations of Great Britain and Ireland, he ſays, "The former "enjoys the beſt PRACTICAL Conſtitution "and Government, which any Nation has "ever experienced." We have the ſame conſtitution in Theory; and I would aſk, therefore, why we cannot have the ſame in Practice? Will nothing reform the practice, but an Union with Britain? No, truly. It is ſuddenly and ſagaciouſly diſcovered that all the maladies of the ſtate, and every ſpecies of diſorder in it, (be the Cauſes, and Symptoms, what they may) are now to be cured only by the one newly invented Patent Medicine;

dicine: like the Quack Doctor Sangrado, in Gil Blas, who cured all HIS Patients by an Union—of Bleeding and Warm Water.

Is there any phyſical impoſſibility to prevent Ireland, in her own ſeparate right, from enjoying the ſame practical Conſtitution and Government as England? Has it been decreed that ſhe, and thoſe ſtates only to whom ſhe may chooſe to impart it, ſhall enjoy that Bleſſing? Suppoſe any Antipodal Nation poſſeſſed the ſame Theoretical Conſtitution and Government as England, is it impoſſible that it ſhould enjoy it practically, without "relinquiſhing it's ſeparate Independency as a ſtate," and ſending it's Members up through the Centre of the Earth, or circumnavigating them round the globe, in order to take their ſeats in the Britiſh Houſe of Commons? I proteſt, I begin to fancy that this Thing called an Union was one of the Objects of Lord Macartney's Embaſſy to China!

This Gentleman goes on to inculcate the peculiar policy of the meaſure from the Ex-

ample of FRANCE!!! "that deſperate and unprincipled power" (to uſe his own words) which has been the ſcourge of all the countries within her graſp; cruelly dictating to and forcing them to abandon their own eſtabliſhed Conſtitutions, and to unite with her. Here is a very worthy model to be held out for our imitation! France indeed "has not "only united to herſelf and incorporated a "great addition of Territory, but has ren-"dered abſolutely dependent on her will al-"moſt all the ſmaller ſtates which ſurround "her." If example, whether good, bad, or indifferent, is to be followed, let us become ferocious ſavages at once. But, how has France brought about the union of the abovementioned States? In WAR, and by right of CONQUEST. Is England at War with Us? Are we a Conqueſt of England? Then, how does the Example of France apply?

Says he, "The Iriſh Parliament is ſup-"poſed to be in a great degree ſubject to "Britiſh Influence." And, is it in order to make it in a greater degree ſubject to Britiſh

tiſh Influence that an Union is to be deſired? At preſent, we have a ſubſtantive Houſe of Commons, conſiſting of 300 Members, conſtitutionally unconnected with the Engliſh parliament. The plan of Union is thought to be, "that a reaſonable repreſentation may be ſelected." The number in the Britiſh houſe is 558. UBI MAJOR PARS EST, IBI EST TOTUM, is a ſettled maxim. If the major part of the united parliament be Engliſh, then is the Whole Engliſh. What ſays our Law?—"Whenever a greater eſtate and a leſs coincide and meet, in one and the ſame perſon, the leſs is immediately annihilated; or, in the law phraſe, is ſaid to be MERGED, that is ſunk, or drowned, in the greater." The leſs eſtate of Iriſh repreſentatives would be therefore immediately annihilated, or merged; that is ſunk, or drowned, in the greater. If an Union of two Legiſlatures is to be founded on the principles of Equity, let the number of members from each be equal. But, it is plain that, while the number is at all greater on the ſide of England, the laws made by ſuch a parliament

may

may be enacted by Engliſhmen, and not by Iriſhmen: or, on the other hand, ſuppoſing the greater part to conſiſt of Members delegated from this Kingdom, then, on the ſame principle, the laws might be enacted by an Iriſh, and not by an Engliſh, Legiſlature. If, then, the Iriſh Parliament is now ſuppoſed to be in a great degree ſubject to Britiſh influence, as this arguer ſays; how much greater and more effectual, muſt that influence be, when there would exiſt 558 voices againſt 300. (even ſuppoſing no reduction of the preſent Iriſh Repreſentation.) The Parliament of Ireland would be completely in a Parentheſis! It might be left in, or out, without altering the Senſe of the Britiſh Legiſlature. All the Buſineſs of Ireland might be moſt happily diſpatched, without the vote or buſy intermeddling of any one of it's own Members. When the Speaker of the Britiſh Houſe of Commons takes his ſeat; will he aſk, are the Iriſh Members come yet? No. If there be a ſufficient Number to conſtitute a Houſe, it will not be inquired whether any of them are from Ireland, or not: and the houſe will

proceed

proceed to Buſineſs, even though all the Iriſh Members ſhould be at Grand Cairo, or Ballynamuck. Here would be a full and complete repreſentation of the People of Ireland in Parliament! Although Paddy in the Gallery may blunder and ſay, "By my own Shoul, this is a famiſh Repreſentation! Theſe Engliſhmen are fine Iriſh Members!"—And yet, one of the objects propoſed by an Union is, to do away Britiſh Influence.

"The Abſentee Proprietors of land might "in ſome degree increaſe; and London, as "at preſent, would be the general reſort "for buſineſs, for advancement, for pleaſure." Mark the Levity with which he talks of Abſentees! One of the greateſt grievances, which this country ſuffers, would not ceaſe, or be in any degree alleviated; but "might "in ſome degree INCREASE!" Hear him! Hear him! Hear him!

"Britiſh faction would ceaſe to operate "HERE;" that is to ſay, the local operation of

of it would be changed: the Scene would ſhift from Dublin to Weſtminſter.

The quotations from Meſſrs. Adams and Waſhington are perfectly inapplicable. It is a well known adage that one Kingdom divided againſt itſelf, cannot ſtand; but, how does that apply to the caſe of two ſeparate and independent kingdoms, having two ſeparate and independent parliaments? Such parliaments cannot be divided; becauſe they are not one. The Iriſh parliament may be divided againſt itſelf; and ſo may the Engliſh; but one cannot be divided againſt the other, becauſe they are not one. They cannot have any diverſity of opinion on the ſame ſubject; becauſe they never can debate on the ſame ſubject; Ireland being to legiſlate for itſelf, and England for itſelf. But, form an Union; and, then indeed, the united parliament may be divided againſt itſelf; and, in that caſe, the majority, which would be ENGLISH, muſt bind. Admitting Iriſhmen to ſeats in the Engliſh houſe, as this Arguer ſays, would be like inviting a man to dinner;

and,

and, on his acceptance of the invitation, ſhutting the door in his face.

The Honorable Gentleman has gone into a detail relative to the rivalry between Proteſtants and Catholics, in order to ſhew the utility of an Union: to which I ſhall ſay no more, than that I feel concern that the differences of religion ſhould have made any part of his diſcuſſion. In my opinion, it is a topic which ought to reſt in ſilence.—— But, I am at a Loſs to comprehend what he means by ſaying, "Ireland would be in a natural ſituation; for, all the Proteſtants of the Empire being united, She would have the proportion of fourteen to three, in favor of her eſtabliſhment; whereas, at preſent, there is a proportion of three to one againſt it." And "The Catholics would loſe the advantage of the argument of numbers, which they at preſent enjoy." I certainly am at a loſs to comprehend how Ireland, after an Union, ſtill ſeparated on the Map of Europe from Great Britain, could have the proportion of fourteen to three, or

any

any proportion whatſoever, in favor of her eſtabliſhment; or how the Catholics could loſe the advantage of the argument of numbers, which they at preſent enjoy. Will an Union have the magic and miraculous power of converting three Millions of Engliſh Proteſtants into Catholics, and the ſame number of Iriſh Catholics into Proteſtants? How then is the proportion of fourteen to three to be effected? Let me Conſider——I have it——This Gentleman has forgotten to tell us that one of the Articles of Union is to be that, immediately upon the Act of Parliament receiving the Royal Aſſent, three Millions of Engliſh Proteſtants are to embark for this Kingdom, to be exchanged for the ſame number of Iriſh Catholics; and thus they would loſe the advantage of the argument of Numbers. But, hold—this ſervice would employ all the veſſels in the Britiſh Navy; and, engaged as We are at preſent in a War with France, ſhe might ſeize the opportunity to invade both Kingdoms. For which reaſon, this Advocate for an Union muſt ſee that the meaſure ought to be

adjourned

adjourned until the end of the War, at leaſt.

" The Peerage would probably, in any " plan of Union, be repreſented like the " Scotch Peers, by a delegation to the Bri- " tiſh parliament. This arrangement would " not affect thoſe Nobles, who are Peers of " Great Britain; and it would be favorable " to thoſe who reſide in Great Britain." See how much alive and attentive the Honorable Gentleman is to the intereſt of thoſe Nobles, who are Peers of Great Britain, and of thoſe who reſide in Great Britain. I'll venture to ſtake twenty of my Pamphlets to one of his, that the meaſure would be favorable to every Man, Woman, and Child, who reſides in Great Britain. But I am very weak indeed, if I am not right in thinking that, in as far as it would be advantageous in this reſpect to Great Britain, ſo far, of courſe, it muſt be diſadvantageous to Ireland. Is this gentleman an Engliſhman, writing for England, in order to curry Favor with her? If he is, I incline to make ſome allowances for

his ſelfiſh patriotiſm; at the ſame time expecting that I am to be excuſed for being equally intereſted for the Advantage and Honor of my native Country. DAMUS VENIAM, PETIMUSQUE VICISSIM.

"There are forty one of the former claſs, "and about eighty of the latter. The re- "maining fourſcore peers, who attend par- "liament occaſionally, would be the only "peers materially intereſted; but almoſt all "of thoſe have conſiderable property in "land." This Gentleman ſeems to treat the Iriſh Nobility, as a Grazier does his Stock. Says he to his Herdſman; "There are forty one of the Bullocks, and about eighty of the Sheep, fit for Market; they are to be driven to Smithfield. The remaining fourſcore muſt be kept grazing upon their uſual paſture, until we ſhall decide how to diſpoſe of them."——Would this Gentleman wiſh to ſee fourſcore of the Engliſh Peers turned to graſs in this

this manner? If not, will he allow an Iriſhman to entertain ſome degree of reſpect for the Iriſh Peerage; which now forms one of the ſupreme branches of the Legiſlature; and the greater part of which he, in the moſt flippant, and (as I conceive) diſreſpectful manner, conſigns to Ruſtication.

As to the Bar, he ſays, "As the pro-"feſſion will not ſupport by any means "the numbers which purſue it, Lawyers "in Ireland extend their circle to poli-"tics." And again; "Were a legiſlative "Union to take place, Iriſh lawyers "would be deprived of the parliamentary "market for their abilities and ambition." What then muſt they do? Are they to confine themſelves to profeſſional proſpects? No. He declares that the profeſſion will not ſupport by any means the numbers which purſue it; and at the ſame time, and in the ſame breath, adds that an Union would deprive them of the only other market for their abilities and ambition. Here is another inſtance of his diſreſpect towards the moſt reſpectable

table body, rendered doubly ſo by their arduous and diſtinguiſhed ſervices during the late perils in Ireland. Poſſibly he forgets, or might wiſh to forget, that they form part, a principal, the leading, part of that glorious Phalanx, who ſtood forward, in the hour of peril, againſt the uplifted hand of Rebellion; and whom the public voice proclaims, and acknowledges with gratitude, as the Saviours of this country. When the moſt formidable conſpiracy was ripened, to deſtroy the Union of Affection between the two countries, they were the firſt and the laſt to oppoſe it; and it is no *mal a propos* circumſtance, that ſuch of them as were Members of Parliament were amongſt the foremoſt in the Ranks.—So much for their late Services.—And now, let me remind this Gentleman that our Law-books and Hiſtorians have branded that Legiſlature, in which there were no Lawyers, with the Epithet of "The LACK-LEARNING Parliament;" and that Sir Edward Cooke obſerves that there never was a good law made thereat. And, let me aſk the Gentleman, who are or ought to be ſuppoſed

more

more competent to make Laws than thoſe, who have made the Laws their Study? Does the Knowledge, acquired from the ſtudy of the Laws, incapacitate from the making of them? TULLY was of a different opinion; it is neceſſary, ſays he, for a Senator to be thoroughly acquainted with the Conſtitution; and this, he declares, is a knowledge of the moſt extenſive nature; a matter of Science, of Diligence, of Reflexion: without which, no Senator can poſſibly be fit for his office.

The honorable and pious mention, which this Gentleman makes of the CLERGY, ought not to paſs quite unnoticed. To demonſtrate to them, ſays he, the advantages of an Union, would be loſt labour indeed. Is it becauſe this venerable body of men are Guilty of more Learning and Information than Laymen, and conſequently more likely to detect and expoſe his fallacious doctrines, that the Benefit of Clergy is not allowable in this caſe? If he has any ſenſe of feeling for the public reception which his

performance has met, he muſt be convinced by this time, that it is loſt Labour indeed from beginning to end.

Why is an Union to be made the Condition of all the Advantages held out to Us, and publiſhed by this Gentleman in his Column of "WANTS? Why may not theſe be attained by us, as well WITHOUT, as WITH, an Union? Is the Effect to be produced by no other Cauſe? If it would be beneficial to the Nation, why has it not been ſought by the Nation? It cometh in a very queſtionable Shape. Perhaps it may too much reſemble a BENEFIT, impoſed by the Manager of a Theatre, upon one of his unfortunate Actors; which, after paying the Expences of the Houſe, turns out to his RUIN.

"The vice of our former connexion "with England was that Great Britain "made laws to bind Ireland, without "binding herſelf at the ſame time by "the ſame Laws." It occurs to me that an Union would produce a more flagrant Vice. If Great Britain, after an Union, could

could or would impoſe Taxes on herſelf, and make laws to enforce them, without binding Ireland in ſome meaſure at the ſame time by the ſame laws, an Union would not ſeem ſo injurious in this point of view. But, there's the Rub. After an Union, Great Britain would not and could not make Laws to bind herſelf, without binding Ireland in ſome meaſure at the ſame time by the ſame laws. This indeed would be the vice of our connexion. At this Day, it is the excluſive privilege of the Iriſh Commons to tax themſelves; and, ſo jealous are they of this valuable privilege, that herein they will not ſuffer the other houſe to exert any power, but that of rejecting: they will not permit the leaſt alteration or amendment to be made by the Lords, to the mode of taxing the people by a Money Bill. If, then, ſuch a Jealouſy Conſtitutionally ſubſiſts between the Commons and Lords, branches of one and the ſame Legiſlature, how much greater muſt the Jealouſy of the People of Ireland be towards not only the Lords but the Commons of a foreign Legiſlature?

Union

Union is become ſo much the Rage, that I ſhould not be at all ſurpriſed, if We were ſhortly to be entertained with a Diſh of "Arguments for and againſt an Union, between the Bank of England and the Bank of Ireland, conſidered:" and I preſume that the Cook, as in the caſe before Us, would firſt invite Us to taſte a little Morſel of it, by viewing the queſtion in the Abſtract, thus:

"Two independent National Banks, finding their ſeparate exiſtence mutually inconvenient, propoſe to form themſelves into one Bank, for their MUTUAL benefit."

And, after ſeaſoning our Appetites, he would proceed, without further Ceremony, to CRAM it down our Throats, as in the Caſe before Us:

"Were any perſon to exclaim, who ſhall dare to propoſe that the Independence of the Bank of Ireland ſhall be annihilated? I would anſwer him by another queſtion.—If

the

the Conveniencies, the Security, of the people of Ireland will be improved by an incorporation of the Iriſh with the Engliſh Bank, ſhall we not for ſuch advantages endeavour to procure that Incorporation ?— —The queſtion of forming an Union between two National Banks, muſt never be confuſed with the ſubjection of one Bank to another.—If the meaſure of forming an Union between two National Banks, whoſe ſeparate exiſtence is inconvenient, is abſtractedly agreeable to reaſon and philoſophy; and if, in many inſtances, it has been attended with advantage to the contracting parties, it is plainly a ſubject for temperate diſcuſſion.— What can any ſanguine Iriſh Trader wiſh for his Bank, but that it's Governor and Company ſhould attain the ſame Habits, Manners, and Improvements, which make the Bank of England the envy of Europe ? and, by what means can he hope to attain that end ſo effectually, as by uniting with her Bank, and binding up all her intereſts and concerns in the ſame bottom ? Suppoſing there were no other reaſons which rendered the Union of the

Siſter-Banks deſirable, the State of Europe, and eſpecially of FRANCE, ſeems to dictate it's peculiar policy at the preſent day. France has not only united to herſelf, and incorporated a great addition of SPECIE, but has rendered abſolutely dependent on her will, almoſt all the ſmaller Banks which ſurround her. The Bank of Geneva is incorporated, the Bank of Savoy is incorporated, all the Auſtrian Banks in Flanders, all the German Banks on this ſide of the Rhine, are incorporated. Spain's Bank is ſubject to her influence; the Banks of Holland, Switzerland, Sardinia, and of the new Republic of Italy, are occupied by her Governors; to every country ſhe extends her principles and her intrigues; and on the National Bank of this kingdom her deſigns have been nearly ſucceſful——but, as we wiſh to check the ambition of that deſperate and unprincipled power; and, if that end can only be effected by maintaining and augmenting the power of the Engliſh Bank, we ſhould be favorable to the principle of Union; which muſt increaſe and conſolidate it's reſources——The Governor muſt

reſide

reſide in one of the Banks; THERE would of courſe be the metropolis of Trade and Commerce; THERE would be the real ſeat of Buſineſs; THENCE would flow all the MONEY; and thither would reſort thoſe, who wiſhed for Notes and Poſt-Bills." &c. &c.

Can any thing be more ſtriking than the Parallel between this caſe of an Union of National Banks, and that of our Parliaments; both in it's Plan and Conſequences? Is there any one ſo beſotted, and out of his Senſes, as not to perceive it?

Upon the Whole; the Honorable Gentleman has ſent abroad his Production among Us, in order to feel our Pulſe: and it beats high againſt him. His firſt and fundamental Poſition is unfounded.—The Caſes, cited by him, do not apply—At one Time, he ſeems to addreſs Us, as in the Tone of a Conqueror, ſpeaking to a ſubjugated Province; and as if telling Us, that he will make a moderate and prudent uſe of his Victory. He condeſcends to look upon Us all, as his natural

Sub-

Subjects; invites Us to live with him in London, and to enter into the number of his Citizens.——Ingratitude is another prominent Feature, in this Gentleman's Portrait: every one of my Readers may perceive his Likeneſs, in the Ungrateful Snake, fed and cheriſhed by the Honeſt Countryman!——Abſurdity comes next: if We are to give Credence to him, Theory and Practice cannot flouriſh, except in the Climate of Great Britain: there appears to be ſome noxious Quality, in the political Atmoſphere of Ireland, which excludes Us from the practical Bleſsings of our Conſtitution; the very ſame, in Theory, as the Britiſh —— The Example of modern France is next held out to Us. France dethroned, and murdered, her King; are We to imitate Her? For my part, I do not heſitate to pronounce any Man, as little removed from a Traitor, who dares to hold out, to a Loyal and Affectionate People, the Example of a Regicide Nation;

" Who haſtes to murder, with a Savage Joy!
" Invades around, and Breathes, but to deſtroy.——

Next;

Next; he demonſtrates, with great Succeſs, that, by an Union, the Iriſh Repreſentation will be in a greater degree ſubject to Britiſh Influence—that Abſentees will increaſe—that Britiſh Faction will be taken to the other Side of the Water, out of our View, and out of our Control—that the Catholics will retain the advantage of the Argument of Numbers—that thoſe Nobles, who happen not to be Peers of Great Britain, and thoſe who do not reſide there, will be turned to Graſs—that the Loyal Iriſh Lawyers will be deprived of the Parliamentary Market for their Abilities and Ambition; and, therefore, may Feed upon an "Abridgment of Bacon," or ſtarve—that the Clergy are beneath his Notice—And, in Fine, that We are to ſurrender our Legiſlature, the Diſpoſal of our Lives, our Liberties, and our Properties, into the Hands of a Britiſh Parliament, for ever—From ſuch ADVANTAGES as theſe, Good Lord Deliver Us!

Before I have done it may not be amiſs to ſtate, that the ſtatute 23 Geo. 3.

3. cap. 28, enacts that the right claimed by the people of Ireland to be bound only by laws enacted by his Majeſty and the parliament of this kingdom in all caſes whatever ſhould be and it is thereby declared to be eſtabliſhed and aſcertained FOR EVER, and ſhould at no time thereafter be queſtioned or queſtionable. Have theſe words any force or meaning? Was it not the intention of the legiſlature by this law to ſhut the door for ever againſt all further diſcuſſion of the ſubject? And is not this Gentleman guilty of ſomething little ſhort of a miſdemeanor in endeavouring to perſuade the people of Ireland, or their Repreſentatives, to renounce a right, which, the law of this realm emphatically ſays, ſhall at no time be queſtioned or queſtionable?

One Word more ---The Title of this Gentleman's pamphlet is really curious--- he profeſſes to conſider Arguments for and againſt a queſtion---arguments hammered out in his own forge, and on his own Anvil. He has found the Ore, roaſted it, ſmelted it, made Pigs of it: and, with his PRO Hammer in one Hand, and his CON Hammer

Hammer in the other, he beats out. theſe unfortunate Pigs into fantaſtical and monſtrous Shapes, which he immediately ſets on to fight a pitched battle: whilſt he puts on his Conſidering Cap; and, like Jupiter IN THE CLOUDS, holds the Scales of Victory in his Hand; but ſlyly fillips the Beam, and decides for his favorite Combatants—Thus he UNITES in his own perſon the threefold Character of the Arguer for, the Arguer againſt, and the Conſiderer of his own Arguments for and againſt!

To conclude, in his own Words, "We "have been ſufficiently diſtracted and "haraſſed. We have drank enough "from the bitter Cup of Diſſenſion." it is, therefore, to be hoped, by every well wiſher of this Country, that the Queſtion may drop into the Grave——As many, as are of that Opinion, ſay "AYE." as many, as are of the contrary Opinion, ſay "No."——

The AYES have it.

BRITISH
12 JU 93
MUSEUM